

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for the next 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. I have enjoyed listening to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talk about Senator TOOMEY's amendment and all about subsidies. Well, it is hard to argue about subsidies when we are talking about the Ex-Im Bank generating \$3.7 billion for U.S. taxpayers since 2005.

So if this is a subsidy, we need a lot more of it because you are winning in producing jobs and you are actually producing money for the Treasury. This is a very important tool for us to win in a global economy. I think my colleague from South Carolina who spoke earlier said it best when he talked about the manufacturing jobs that are now in that State and what an important tool it is.

I am not one of those who basically says: Oh, we should do it because other countries do it. I am saying, you should recognize that is going on, but that the United States needs to understand there is a global marketplace for its products. If you believe in U.S. manufacturers, as I do—and I have seen them in my State—they are winning the day in producing products and services that can beat the competition in international marketplaces. They can.

I have seen grain silos, I have seen music stands, and, yes, I have seen airplanes. So the question is, are we going to let U.S. products that can beat the competition in an international marketplace lose because the purchaser of those products is looking for financing mechanisms that will help them secure financing and purchase of those products? That is the question.

Does the United States want to do those kinds of activities? I say we should be even more aggressive. Why? Because the global development of many countries that are now buying U.S. products is going to continue to grow. In my State, in southwest Washington, in Vancouver, I saw the second largest grain elevator in the entire world—the second largest grain elevator. I said: Why do we have the second largest grain elevator in the entire world right here at the Port of Vancouver? They said to me: Because as the Asian middle class rises, they want to eat beef. And if they want to eat beef, they have to have grain.

What is wrong with the United States selling grain to Asian markets because they want our product—or all these other products we have been talking about today? These are examples of products in the United States where we are actually building a product that many countries and many end customers want. We should celebrate that, and we should realize, as the growing middle class around the globe increases, there is even more opportunity for the United States to sell products and win the day in the marketplace. So I do not know what they are talking

about when they say “subsidies,” because this has been good for the U.S. taxpayers, and it has been good for our economy.

Specifically to the Toomey amendment, this amendment would require unnecessary conditions for helping the bank in the future. Basically, it would put a hold on the financing of the Export-Import Bank until we negotiated on an international basis to terminate this kind of financing.

As I said, for many States, they have had great benefits. In Pennsylvania, they have had the economic benefit—this is in just 2011—of \$1.4 billion in exports and over 9,000 jobs. So here is something that has actually created jobs, created money for the U.S. economy—basically money back to U.S. taxpayers that we have used to help pay down the deficit. So how is it that is bad for us? In the meantime, that manufacturer in Pennsylvania is winning and getting his product out on an international basis and, hopefully, expanding his business to many different countries.

We had numbers on some of the other examples of companies that have been helped in various States. These are products and services like many in my State. We have visited a grain silo producer in Spokane, WA, that is winning in selling its product. We visited a music stands company, Manhasset Music Stands. You would think somebody might be able to compete with them and beat them in the international marketplace, but, in fact, they are winning the day in the international marketplace, and the Export-Import Bank helps them in doing so.

There are many examples of how this particular program is a win for taxpayers, is a win for manufacturers, and is a win for the U.S. economy. These amendments that are all trying to gut the Export-Import Bank would send this back to the House, when we need to be sending it to the President's desk, giving certainty and predictability to our economy, giving certainty and predictability to a program that has existed for decades, for which often there has been a voice vote—instead of holding it up, actually making sure manufacturers have the opportunity and know where the financing is.

I yield the floor.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:40 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. WEBB).

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—MOTIONS TO PROCEED

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on Wednesday, May 16, the Senate proceed to the consideration of motions to proceed to the following budget resolutions listed, en bloc: Calendar No. 357, S. Con. Res. 41; Calendar No. 354, H. Con. Res. 112; Calendar No. 356, S. Con. Res. 37; Calendar No. 384, S. Con. Res. 42; and Calendar No. 395, S. Con. Res. 44; that there be 6 hours of debate on the motions to proceed equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on the five motions to proceed in the order listed above; that there be 2 minutes equally divided between the votes and that all after the first vote be 10-minute votes; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that notwithstanding the adoption of any motion to proceed, the Senate proceed to the remaining votes on motions to proceed; further, that at the conclusion of those votes, the Senate resume consideration of the budget resolution if a motion to proceed is adopted; and that if no motion to proceed has been adopted, the majority leader be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there has not been a budget passed in the Senate and the House in over 3 years. I would argue that the exercise we have ending tomorrow will have no substantial difference. I do not think there is anyone in America who believes we will have a budget at the end of tomorrow. The Congressional Budget Act of 1974 requires Congress to pass a budget by April 15. So with that, I ask unanimous consent that the request of the leader be modified so that S. 1981, the No Budget, No Pay Act, be automatically discharged from the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, the bill be immediately placed on the calendar, and that when the Senate proceeds to the budget votes mentioned in the Senator's request, the Senate also vote on the motion to proceed to S. 1981 under the same terms and conditions of the other budget votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. CONRAD. Objection has been heard on our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection to the modification. Is there objection to the original request? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, just on the note that the Senator raised, I want to make clear that I have heard over and over: No budget resolution has passed in 1,000 days. What is not being said is that instead of a budget